

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/600,014	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030209US1	8483	
46797 IBM CORPOR	7590 03/11/200 RATION, INTELLECT	EXAM	EXAMINER		
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1			LIN, SH	LIN, SHEW FEN	
	AY 52 NORTH . MN 55901-7829	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ROCILITER	, 1411 ( 33501-7625		2166		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/11/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/600,014	CHATTERJEE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHEW-FEN LIN	2166		

	SHEW-FEN LIN	2166						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 07 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.						
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appendor for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing	date of the final rejection,							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as					
NOTICE OF APPEAL								
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMAZINA.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t         <ul> <li>(a)</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b)</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown to the policition in better that the proposed in the prop</li></ul></li></ol>	sideration and/or search (see NO) v);	TE below);						
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a d	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).					
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4.12-24,26-28.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	of the status of the claims after en	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:								
/Hosain T Alam/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166	/S. L./ Examiner, Art Unit 2166							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Gupta does not teach, "...selecting an annotation structure form a set of annotation structure s....wherein the selection is based, at sein in part, on the [sic] set of identifying parameters identifying the data object to be annotated". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gupta discloses that annotations correspond to a temporal range of the media content (data object) as defined by a temporal beginning point and a temporal ending point (a set of identifying parameters) (see Gupta, column 2, line 23-26). Furthermore, Gupta teaches that selection contaction structures are based on an annotation type selector, such as text annotation, an audio annotation, or a uniform resource locator (URL) annotation (Figure 7, 290, 292, 294) and beginned points for annotation (Figure 7, 312, 314).

Applicant argues that Altman is silent as to any different types of interface depending on a type of data object being annotated. It is noted that the features upon which applicant refles (i.e., different types of interface depending on a type of data object being annotated in the recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, one interface will meet the requirement of 'one or more interface'.

For the above reasons, the Examiner's stance regarding the status of claims remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.